

end of said first jaw, and biasing means to bias ~~and not to lock~~ said elongate tag engagement means in said first position during movement of the first and second jaws towards each other.--

2 --10. (New) The applicator as claimed in claim 9 wherein said elongate tag engagement means comprises a pin which is pivotal with said driving means so as to lie substantially in a same axis as the first jaw in said second or spent position.--

3 --11. (New) The applicator as claimed in claim 9 wherein said driving means includes at least two sides, and said biasing means is selectively in contact with one of the sides of said driving means as to bias respectively said driving means to the first and second positions.--

4 --12. (New) The applicator as claimed in claim 9 wherein said second jaw is formed with a receiving place to locate one of tag pieces.--

5 --13. (New) The applicator as claimed in claim 9 wherein spring means are provided to bias said handle members and said first and second jaws into a normal position in which said handle members and said jaws are respectively spaced apart from one another.--

6 --14. (New) The applicator as claimed in claim 9 wherein said elongate tag engagement means has a longitudinal axis which passes rearwardly a pivot axis of said driving means from said end of said first jaw.--

REMARKS

Regarding the objection to the specification, the Examiner's attention is drawn to the description of page 6, lines 7-20. As noted, the switch of the driving means between the first and second positions is caused either by pulling the applicator tool away from the animal or by the animal itself getting away from the applicator tool (see lines 13-16 on page 6).

Claim 11, which is similar to claim 5, now defines that the driving means is selectively in contact with one of at least two sides of the driving means to bias respectively the driving means to the first and second positions. It is clear that the driving means is not "automatically" pivoted to the spent position by any "actuating means". Therefore, the objection thereto should be withdrawn.

The indefiniteness rejections of claims 1-8 have been taken care of